

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-16 remain pending in the application upon entry of this amendment, and claims 1, 2, 14, and 16 are amended herein. Independent claims 1 and 16 in part have been amended to incorporate the features of claim 6, which has been canceled. Additional support for the claim amendments may be found in the application at least at the following passages: page 4, lines 5-10; page 16, line 18 to page 17, line 3; page 26, line 22 to page 27, line 4; and Fig. 1.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks.

I. Rejection of Claim 1 – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-16 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Makoto et al., JP 2003-063101 (Makoto) in view of Shin, U.S. Patent No. 5,866,425 (Shin). Although claims 1-16 stand rejected, the Examiner actually has only specifically analyzed the language of claim 1. The Examiner asserts Makoto discloses each and every element of the claimed invention except the feature that the auxiliary power supply is connected to a commercial power supply, which allegedly is taught by Shin. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's application of Makoto, and Makoto is deficient with respect to independent claim 1 as amended.

Makoto is described in the Background section of the current Application at page 2, lines 1-20. In the invention of amended claim 1, the auxiliary power supply supplies power **only** to signal detection circuitry so the device may exit a power saving mode in response to an external signal. In contrast, the device of Makoto is deficient in that the auxiliary power supply supplies power to a sub CPU that performs power saving control, **and** to several interface sections (e.g., fax board, PC board) that communicate with external devices. Makoto, therefore, does not disclose or suggest that the auxiliary power supply circuit supplies power **only** to the signal detection circuit as recited in amended independent claim 1. This feature of claim 1 permits the power supply device to be ready to detect an external signal input with minimum power consumption in the

power saving mode. The device of Makoto cannot achieve this advantage because power must be supplied to several interfaces to external devices even in the power saving mode.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 6 (canceled herein) that “the power control section is configured to determine that external signal input to the signal detection circuit is valid only when the signal matches a predetermined pattern.” The Examiner does not analyze these features in the Office Action, and a review of Makoto reveals the reference indeed does not disclose or suggest such features.

Accordingly, the system of Makoto lacks features of independent claim 1. Shin is cited merely as disclosing a power supply circuit being connected to a commercial power supply. Shin does not make up for the deficiencies of Makoto, and the Examiner does not indicate otherwise. A combination of Makoto and Shin, therefore, does not result in, disclose, or suggest the claimed invention, and the rejections of claim 1 for obviousness should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of the Remaining Claims

Claims 2-5 and 7-15 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1, and independent claim 16 also includes the features of claim 1 analyzed above. Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 7-16 are patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

In addition, as stated above, although all claims stand rejected as being obvious over Makoto in view of Shin, the Examiner has only specifically analyzed the language of claim 1. For example, as to claims 14 and 16 the Examiner does not address which reference, if either at all, teaches the feature of the external device transmitting a piece of data repeatedly to the main apparatus (claim 14), and the power control section including a photo coupler adapted to be responsive to external signal input to the signal detection circuit (claim 16). The referenced feature of claim 14 in particular eliminates the necessity for the main apparatus to analyze a first input signal and additionally having a circuit to analyze an external signal when operating in the power saving mode.

In the power saving mode, therefore, power consumption of the communication system is reduced. The prior art does not disclose or suggest such features, and the Examiner has not demonstrated otherwise.

Generally, the Examiner has not satisfied the requirements for a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of pointing out where in the references each and every element of the claims is taught, and providing the rationale as to why it would have been obvious to combine such features from the respective references. The Examiner, therefore, has not demonstrated a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to any of claims 2-5 and 7-16.

III. Conclusion

Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-16 are believed to be allowable, and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988, our Reference No. KOMOP0109US.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: September 21, 2009

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113